

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 9-12 and 14-22 are pending in the present application with claims 1, 7, 10 and 16 having been amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action mailed March 11, 2004, claims 7 and 16 were objected to; claims 1, 5-7, 9-12 and 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Ostman et al.; and claims 2-4 and 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ostman et al. and Stacey et al.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner indicates that the amendments to the existing independent claims change the scope of each claim, thus requiring further consideration. Thus, the next Office Action cannot be final (i.e., the present amendment is being filed together with an RCE). The Examiner also indicates Ostman et al. discusses "identifying a plurality of users in a single VC" and cites col. 2, lines 34-43. However, as detailed below, the applied art does not teach or multiplexing a plurality of time slots in a same ATM buffer number as in the present invention.

Claims 7 and 16 have been amended in light of the objections noted in the Office Action. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested these objections be withdrawn.

Further, enclosed are certified copies of the claimed Korean priority applications.

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-12 and 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ostman et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the previous amendment filed June 10, 2004, independent claim 1 was amended to recite that the CAM allocates a same ATM buffer number to include different time slots and CIDs in the same ATM buffer number. Independent claims 10 and 16 were amended to include similar features in a varying scope. Comments were also provided that by using a look-up table of the CAM 40 (see Figure 2), for example, in a manner that different time slot numbers and CIDs are allocated for the same ATM buffer numbers, a plurality of time slots can be multiplexed with a single ATM buffer as noted in the specification at page 9, lines 10-13. Comments were also provided that AAPA allocates only one time slot to one VPI/VCI and thus, when there is idle data, it occupies a channel so that the bandwidth efficiency of the ATM network is degraded as noted in the specification at page 4, the first paragraph.

In response to these comments, the Office Action indicates that AAPA teaches a CAM allocating a same ATM buffer number to include different time slots and CIDs in the same ATM buffer number and cites page 1, line 22 and page 3, lines 1-4. The Office Action also indicates there are clearly time slots (256) that are used to create the outgoing ATM cell from buffer 9.

However, it is respectfully noted each of the independent claims recites that the CAM allocates a same ATM buffer number to include different time slots and CIDs (Channel Identifiers) for identifying a plurality of users in a single VC (Virtual Channel) in the same ATM buffer number. Thus, in the CAM 40, the time slot numbers combined with the CIDs for identifying a plurality of users in a single VC is included in the same ATM buffer number. On the contrary, AAPA allocates only one time slot to one VPI/VCI (in a one to one correspondence). AAPA does not include a buffer number corresponding to a time slot number and a CID for identifying a plurality of users in a single VC. That is, AAPA does not discuss combining time slots and CIDs and including a same buffer number for time slot numbers and CID numbers.

Note that independent claims 1, 10 and 16 have been amended to clarify that the CIDs correspond to channel identifiers for identifying a plurality of users in a single VC. It is respectfully submitted this clarification does not raise a new issue as it is clear about the meaning of the term CID.

Accordingly it is respectfully submitted independent claims 1, 10 and 16 and each claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Further, it is respectfully submitted the other rejection noted on the outstanding Office Action has also been overcome as the claims rejected therein are dependent claims

Serial No. 09/745,345
Amdt. dated January 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2004

Docket No. P-0172

and the additional reference also does not teach or suggest the features recited in the independent claims.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David A. Bilodeau**, at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. 09/745,345
Amdt. dated January 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 18, 2004

Docket No. P-0172

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim, Esq.
Registration No. 36,186
David A. Bilodeau, Esq.
Registration No. 42,325

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK/DAB:lew
Date: January 12, 2005

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610

\\fk4\Documents\2000\2000-206\40417.doc